

Serial No. 10/727,433
Belkin et al
Case No. CE10865R

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-8 and 10-19 are currently pending. Claims 9 and 20-27 have been cancelled without prejudice.

According to the Office Action, claims 1-5, 11-1 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0119005 to Segal et al. Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 11 and cancelled claims 20-24 to overcome this rejection. In particular, claims 1 and 11 are directed to creating a call leg between a first wireless communication network and second wireless communication network that are loosely connected wherein the call leg is established to manage and retrieve an on-hold call that is in the first wireless communication network while a wireless communication unit is in the second wireless communication network. The present invention, as found in amended claims 1 and 11, is directed to managing and retrieving on-hold calls between loosely coupled wireless communication networks. As seen in the claims, the wireless communication unit can have placed at least one call on hold when the unit was in the first wireless communication network. At sometime after placing that call on-hold, the wireless communication unit can be handed out to the second wireless communication network. According to the prior, the on-hold call would be dropped and therefore unattainable by the wireless communication unit when it is in the second wireless communication network or when the wireless communication unit returned to the first wireless communication network. According to the present invention, a call leg is established between the first and second wireless communication networks so that the on-hold call can remain as a part of the first wireless communication network. In other words, the call leg is established in part to maintain a connection between the first and second wireless communication networks so that the wireless communication unit while in the second wireless communication network can access the on-hold call, which is still a part of the first wireless communication network. Thus, claims 1 and 11 are directed to the use of the call leg between the wireless communication networks after the wireless communication unit has been handed out to the second communication network.

Serial No. 10/727,433
Belkin et al
Case No. CE10865R

Segal, on the other hand, does not discuss how to manage and retrieve the on-hold call in the first wireless communication network when the wireless communication unit has been handed out to the second communication network. Segal is directed to maintaining an on-hold call during the hand out of a wireless communication unit from a first wireless communication network to the second communication network. In other words, Segal is directed to the process of maintaining and not dropping an on-hold call during the hand out process. On the other hand, the present invention is directed to managing the on-hold call after the hand out has been completed. Thus, Segal and the present invention are not directed to the same problem.

In fact, Segal teaches away from the present invention. As seen in Fig. 5 and the accompanying text of cited reference, Segal teaches that the on-hold call is also handed over to second wireless communication network. Fig. 5 explains the calls can be placed on hold when the wireless communication unit is in the first wireless communication network. When it is determined that the wireless communication unit is to be handed out, a call leg is established between the first and second wireless communication networks. In step 509, the on-hold calls are coupled to the call leg. Then, the on-hold calls are placed in the second wireless communication network in step 511. This is contrary to the present invention because the on-hold call is maintained in the first wireless communication network and the call leg is used to connect the wireless communication unit, which in the second wireless communication unit, to the on-hold call in the first wireless communication network.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Segal does not disclose maintaining the on-hold call in the first wireless communication network and using the call leg to manage and retrieve the on-hold call while the wireless communication unit is in the second wireless communication network. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Segal does not anticipate the present invention as found in amended independent claims 1 and 11. As claims 2-5 and 12-13 depend upon and included the limitations of claims 1 and 11, respectfully, Applicants also respectfully submit that Segal does not anticipate the present invention as found in these dependent claims. Thus, Applicants request that the rejection under Section 102(e) be withdrawn.

Serial No. 10/727,433
Belkin et al
Case No. CE10865R

Claims 6-9, 14-18 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segal in view of United States Patent No. 5,913,166 to Buttitta et al. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 11 upon which claims 6-9 and 14-18 depend upon respectively. Applicants have also cancelled claims 25-27. Assuming that Buttitta discloses the elements stated in the Office Action, Buttitta does not disclose the use of a call leg to manage and retrieve an on-hold call in a first wireless communication network while a wireless communication unit is in a second wireless communication network. For the reasons given above in connection with the rejection under Section 102(e), Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Segal and Buttitta does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the invention found in claims 6-9 and 14-18. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that these claims are not obvious in view of Segal and Buttitta. Thus, it is requested that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segal in view of United States Patent No. 6,871,070 to Ejzak. Applicants have amended claim 1 upon which claim 10 depends. Assuming that Ejzak discloses the DTMF signally, it does not disclose the use of a call leg to manage and retrieve an on-hold call in a first wireless communication network while a wireless communication unit is in a second wireless communication network. For the reasons given above in connection with the rejection under Section 102(e), Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Segal and Ejzak does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the invention found in claim 10. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that these claims are not obvious in view of Segal and Ejzak. Thus, it is requested that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segal and Buttitta in view of Ejzak. Applicants have amended claim 11 upon which claim 19 depends. Assuming that Ejzak discloses the DTMF signally, it does not disclose the use of a call leg to manage and retrieve an on-hold call in a first wireless communication network while a wireless communication unit is in a second wireless communication network. For the reasons given above in connection with the rejection under Section 102(e), Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Segal, Buttitta and Ejzak

Serial No. 10/727,433
Belkin et al
Case No. CE10865R

does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the invention found in claim 19. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that these claims are not obvious in view of Segal, Buttitta and Ejzak. Thus, it is requested that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

As the Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,
Belkin, Anatoly S. et al.



By:

Simon B. Anolick
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 37,585
Telephone: 847-576-4234
Fax: 847-576-3750

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 22917